DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 889 CS 503 937

AUTHOR Morgan, Willie B.
TITLE A Survey of Voice/Speech Improvement Teaching in U. S. Colleges and Universities.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Educational Research; Higher Education; School Surveys; Speech; *Speech Communication; *Speech Curriculum; *Speech Improvement; *Speech Instruction; Theater Arts
IDENTIFIERS *Voice Qualities

ABSTRACT

The results of a survey of college speech departments, conducted to gain information on the current status of voice/speech improvement training, department course offerings, and general approaches used by individual teachers are contained in this report. The report begins with a description of the survey and information on the respondents. The major portion of the report contains the survey results, divided as follows: (1) coursework offered by departments; (2) instructors' status, background, and approaches to teaching; (3) breathing concepts in voice and speech improvement; (4) phonation and resonance in voice improvement; (5) dialects and standardization of speech; and (6) common voice/speech problems. A brief section of concluding observations on the results is followed by a bibliography, most of which contains textbook titles cited in response to a question on the survey. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED221889

A SURVEY OF VOICE/SPEECH IMPROVEMENT TEACHING IN U. S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by

Willie B. Morgan

Department of
Speech and Dramatic Arts
Eastern Michigan University

1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Willie B. Morgan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 503 937

Copyright 1980 by Willie B. Morgan

Information from this publication may be used freely without permission from the author when clear and specific reference is made to the source.

Printed at Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank all the department chairpersons and teachers of voice/speech improvement courses in the hundreds of colleges and universities who responded to my request for information. I understand the confinement that many choice-oriented items placed on informants, especially teachers of oral communication. However, the personal comments and detailed explanations received were most plentiful. Rest assured that every comment has been read carefully, noted in my research files, and consulted for the interpretation statements about the statistical data.

I am grateful also to Eastern Michigan University for the sabbatical leave that has allowed me to conduct this study and for computer service. My department head, Dr. Thomas J. Murray, has been most helpful with his advice and support services.

Contents

Background of the Study 1

Data on Course Work Offered by Departments 4

Instructors and Approaches to Teaching 8

Breathing Concepts 13

Phonation and Resonance Concepts 15

Standardization of Speech 23

Common Voice/Speech Problems 27

Concluding Observations 29

Bibliography 30

A SURVEY OF VOICE/SPEECH IMPROVEMENT TEACHING IN U. S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Background of the Study

This study is based on a survey that was conducted during a sabbatical leave from Eastern Michigan University during 1978-1979. The purpose of the study was to get a perspective on the current status of voice/speech improvement teaching in higher education. Both departmental course offerings and general approaches used by individual teachers were the areas to be covered. Data was requested concerning instructors' approaches to teaching, their general theoretical concepts, and their perceptions about the voice problems of their students.

The specific topics included, or questions asked, were selected by the author. Each represents a concern that has been noted from discussions and workshops with professional colleagues, from the reading of speech science literature and texts on voice and performance, and from dealing with the concerns of students in voice/speech improvement and performance classes for the past twenty years. Topics on which few controversial views have been noted were excluded.

Survey forms were sent to twenty departments in five states to test the clarity of the questions and instructions. Several items were reworded based on these initial responses. To provide the widest possible base of data for this study, the decision was made to send survey forms to every department in all four-year colleges or universities which offers a major program in Speech Communication or Theatre or both. The large number of two-year colleges in existence would have made correspondence unreasonable for the number of useful responses that could be expected. For instance, a recent survey of two-year institutions in Michigan indicated that only three of twenty-eight programs (11%) offer a course in this area (Covert, p. 53). It is probable that the incidence of such course work is rather low in other states

as well and that any courses offered would usually reflect the approaches used at four-year institutions in each area.

The primary source for compiling the mailing list was the 1977-1978 Speech Communication Directory. The directory provides two departmental listings when theatre is separated from speech. Additional theatre departments, not included there, were added from the School Section of the 1978 Directory of American Theatre Association and from the Directory of American Theatre Programs (ATA 1976).

The total number of departments to which a questionaire was sent was 865 in 745 different academic institutions, including professional theatre schools which offer a fine arts degree, e.g., The North Carolina School of the Arts. Ten surveys were returned by the postal service as undeliverable. The primary mailing was done in November 1978.

Responses to the Survey

Survey responses were received from 308 departments of the 855 to which questionaires were delivered (36%). Of these 308 departments, 83 do not offer specific courses in voice/speech improvement (27%). Courses are offered in 225 departments (73%). However, two of these departments responded too late for their data to be included in the detailed analysis.

The responses to each item have been tabulated to show both the absolute frequency and the relative frequency (percent) for each category. Where ambiguity prevailed in the data, a reasonable interpretation was made in an attempt to utilize the response.

Speech or general theatre degrees or both are offered by 171 of the departments analyzed (77%). Professional performance degrees are offered in 52 of these departments (23%). The professional performance degree was considered to be a BFA or MFA in acting, or a degree with a specified professional orientation, e.g., the M.A. in Performance at Purdue University. Many of the departments offering professional training also grant degrees in speech or general theatre. Some of the departments without professional degrees do offer rather intensive acting programs, but criteria for classifying them as professional were lacking.

Twenty-two of the 52 departments offering professional training indicated that two or more instructors teach courses in voice/speech improvement. To broaden the response base for instructors in professional programs, duplicate questionaires were sent to these departments. Fourteen additional teachers responded.

Therefore, the total number of informants for voice/speech instruction is 237; 171 in general programs (72%) and 66 in professional programs (28%). Table 1 indicates that the informants are fairly evenly distributed between ranks. "Directors" of voice/speech improvement work often did not include their specific rank, hence the large number in the "administrator" category. It may be significant to note that a greater proportion of teachers of voice/speech improvement appear to be below associate professor level in professional programs. This may reflect the relatively recent expansion of such programs, especially MFA degrees (Directory of American Theatre Programs, p. 91). The "other" category was usually a term such as "artist in residence."

TABLE 1: Distribution of Informants by Rank or Position

Rank or Position	All Informants (237) No.	%	Non-Professional (171) No.	%	Professional (66) No.	%
Administrator (chair, head, assistant, director, etc.	63	27	51	30	12	18
Full Professor	36	15	29	17	7	11
Associate Professor	48	20	38	22	10	15
Assistant Professor	48	20	33	19	15	23
Instructor/Lecturer	35	15	18	11	17	26
Other	5	2	0	0	5	8

Geographical distribution of informants is shown in Table 2. The categories correspond to regional speech associations.

TABLE 2: Geographical Distribution of Informants

Geographical Area	All Informants (237) No.	%	Non-Professional (171) No.	%	Professional (66) No.	%
Northeastern states	35	14	26	15	9	14
Southern states	74	31	58	34	16	24
Central states	94	40	60	35	34	52
Western states	34	14	27	16	7	11

Data on Course Work Offered by Departments

Of the 223 departments for which data were available, 171 offer only speech or general theatre degrees and 52 offer a professional performance degree. These categories will be referred to as all programs and non-professional programs or professional programs, and they are abbreviated in the tables as All (223), Non-Prof (171), and Prof (52).

The majority of all courses offered are intended for majors in various areas of speech and theatre and may be elected by non-majors. Table 3 reveals that more than half the departments which offer a professional program restrict some voice/speech improvement courses to students in professional acting training, but note that three-quarters of these departments do offer courses that are available to more general students.

TABLE 3: Students for Whom Courses in Voice/Speech Improvement are Intended

Intentions	All (223) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (52) No.	%
Courses intended for majors in theatre/speech communication/ radio-TV/communication disorders--and may be elected by non-majors	183	82	160	94	23	44
Courses intended for students in professional acting training	12	5	0	0	12	23
Separate courses provided for both types of students	24	11	7	4	17	33

Number of Courses Offered

About three-fourths of all departments offer only one first level course in voice/speech improvement. However, nearly one-third of the departments offering professional programs offer two or more first level courses.

TABLE 4: Number of First Level Courses Taught in Voice/Speech Improvement

Courses	All (223) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (52) No.	%
1	163	73	130	76	33	64
2	39	18	23	14	16	31
3-4	6	3	5	3	1	2

Less than half of all departments offer any advanced level courses. However, about five of every six departments with professional programs offer one or more advanced courses. One-fourth of them offer three to eight. Note that one-half of all advanced courses reported are taught in departments offering professional acting training programs.

TABLE 5: Number of Advanced Level Courses Taught in Voice/Speech Improvement

Courses	All (223) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (52) No.	%
0	121	54	112	66	9	17
1	44	20	24	14	20	39
2	22	10	12	7	10	19
3-4	18	8	9	5	9	17
5-8	6	3	2	1	4	8
No Response	12	5	12	7	0	0

Estimated Enrollments

Three-fifths of all these departments enroll no more than 60 students each year in first level voice/speech improvement courses. Table 6 reveals that enrollment percentages are nearly the same for all types of programs.

TABLE 6: Estimated Number of Students Enrolled in First Level Courses Each Year

Students	All (223) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (52) No.	%
20 or fewer	47	21	36	21	11	21
21-40	56	25	42	25	14	27
41-60	28	13	21	12	7	14
61-100	31	14	19	11	12	23
101-140	14	6	12	7	2	4
141-180	16	7	14	8	2	4
181 or more	14	6	11	6	3	5
No Response	17	8	16	9	1	2

Enrollments are rather low for all advanced courses, as might be assumed. In Table 7, "none" includes departments without advanced courses and no responses.

TABLE 7: Estimated Number of Students Enrolled in All Advanced Courses Each Year

Students	All (223) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (52) No.	%
20 or fewer	36	16	16	9	20	39
21-40	27	12	16	9	11	21
41-60	17	8	8	5	9	17
61-100	6	3	2	1	4	8
101 or more	4	2	4	3	0	0
None	133	60	125	73	8	15

Students per Class

The most frequent average class size for courses in voice/speech improvement is 16-20 students. This number prevails in about one-third of all classes. Note in Table 8 that a higher percentage of professional programs average 11-15 students per class than non-professional programs. While twenty-four departments (11%) average more than 25 students in each class, only one of them offers a professional program.

TABLE 8: Average Number of Students in Most Classes

Students	All (223)		Non-Prof (171)		Prof (52)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
10 or fewer	12	5	9	5	3	6
11-15	56	25	37	22	19	37
16-20	75	34	52	30	23	44
21-25	47	21	41	24	6	12
26-30	17	8	16	9	1	2
31-35	5	2	5	3	0	0
36-40	2	1	2	1	0	0

Table 9 shows that the maximum enrollment permitted in classes is 20 or fewer students for one-third of all programs and for three-fifths of professional ones. While twenty-five departments (11%) permit more than 30 students in a class, only two of them offer professional training.

TABLE 9: Maximum Number of Students Permitted in Any Class

Students	All (223)		Non-Prof (171)		Prof (52)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
11-15	21	9	12	7	9	17
16-20	54	24	32	19	22	42
21-25	57	26	42	25	15	29
26-30	45	20	42	25	3	6
31-35	16	7	14	8	2	4
36-40	4	2	4	2	0	0
41-50	5	2	5	3	0	0

Student-Teacher Contact Hours

Three-quarters of all courses meet for 3-4 hours each week. Table 10 reveals that this is true in professional programs as well as non-professional ones. Some of these departments, undoubtedly, offer courses in "short" terms, such as the quarter system.

TABLE 10: Number of Hours of Instruction in Each Course per Week

Hours/Week	All (223) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (52) No.	%
1	2	1	2	1	0	0
2	19	9	16	9	3	6
3-4	168	75	129	75	39	75
5-6	23	10	16	9	7	14
7-12	5	2	2	1	3	6
No Response	6	3	6	4	0	0

The number of hours that each student can work with the instructor individually or in a small group during the first level course varies too much for any generalization.

TABLE 11: Number of Hours Each Student Can Work with the Instructor Individually or in a Small Group of Two-Four Persons During the First Level Course

Hours/Course	All (223) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (52) No.	%
0	29	13	21	12	8	15
1	38	17	33	19	5	10
2	23	10	15	9	8	15
3-4	26	12	22	13	4	8
5-6	10	5	7	4	3	6
7-9	6	3	5	3	1	2
10-12	14	6	11	6	3	6
13-15	3	1	2	1	1	2
16 or more	11	5	9	5	2	4
Flexible	35	16	23	14	12	23
No Response	28	13	23	14	5	10

Number of Instructors

Half of all departments have only one instructor who regularly teaches their voice/speech improvement courses. Table 12 reveals that another fourth have two regular teachers in this area. Few departments have three or more instructors who handle such courses.

TABLE 12: Number of Individuals Who Regularly Teach Courses in This Area

Instructors	All (223) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (52) No.	%
0	2	1	2	1	0	0
1	120	53	95	56	25	48
2	51	23	36	21	15	29
3	23	10	16	9	7	14
4	11	5	7	4	4	8
5 or more	7	3	6	4	1	2
No Response	9	4	9	5	0	0

Instructors and Approaches to Teaching

Of the 237 instructors who supplied data, 171 teach in speech or general theatre programs and 66 teach in programs offering professional training. These categories will be referred to as all instructors and instructors in non-professional programs or in professional programs, and they are abbreviated in the tables as All (237), Non Prof (171), and Prof (66).

Primary Instruction Responsibility

Only one-sixth of the instructors of voice/speech improvement courses devote half or more of their time to this discipline. However, more than one-third of the instructors in professional programs do. Table 13 indicates that the primary area of instruction for most teachers is performance and directing, or both performance and non-performance courses. One in seven instructors responding teaches primarily in speech science, therapy, or linguistic areas; but only three of them are teaching in professional programs.

TABLE 13: Statement that Best Characterizes Instruction Position

Position	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Voice-artic-speech courses	38	16	15	9	23	35
Performance and/or directing	69	29	42	25	27	41
Speech science, therapy, or linguistics	32	14	29	17	3	5
Non-performance areas	16	7	15	9	1	2
Both performance and non-performance areas	75	31	63	36	12	18
Other	7	3	7	4	0	0

Influences on Teaching

One of the strongest influences on the teaching of voice/speech improvement is traditional speech science and theory concepts for nearly half of all teachers. Table 14 indicates, however, that these concepts strongly influence only one-third of the instructors in professional programs. About one-third of the informants consider the influences on their work to be too eclectic for any classification.

About one-fifth of the instructors are strongly influenced by the Lessac System; nearly the same number are influenced by the Linklater-Warren approach. Each of these two influences rises to one-third or more for instructors in professional

programs. Other specific British influences mentioned were Berry (7 responses) and Turner/Morrison (7 responses). Three informants indicated that Skinner was the strongest influence on their teaching. Several informants referred to the influence of the speech scientists Jon Eisenson, Frank Wilson, and Morton Cooper.

Few instructors outside of professional programs indicated that vocal music instruction has strongly influenced their approach to teaching.

TABLE 14: Strongest Influences on Present Approach to Teaching Voice/Speech Improvement

Influences	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Traditional speech science and therapy concepts	108	46	85	49	23	35
Too eclectic for classification	72	30	60	35	12	18
The Lessac System	47	20	25	15	22	33
The Linklater-Warren approach	43	18	17	10	26	39
British professional teachers	24	10	9	5	15	23
Vocal music instruction	20	8	5	3	15	23
Other	25	11	15	9	10	15

Texts

The most frequently used texts for the first level course in voice/speech improvement are written by Eisenson, Fisher, and Lessac. The next most popular ones are by Linklater, Anderson, and Mayer. (For full citations of texts, see the Bibliography.)

In professional programs, Lessac and Linklater texts tie for first place. However, Linklater's text is significantly less frequently used by instructors in non-professional programs. Several informants indicated that more than one text is used in the first level course. Texts cited by fewer than three instructors are not itemized except for Skinner's. Hers is included for it is used in two professional programs and no other text cited was used in more than one of them.

TABLE 15: Texts Used Most Frequently in the First Level Course

Texts by Author	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
None	28	12	18	11	10	15
Anderson	20	8	17	10	3	5
Berry	9	4	3	2	6	9
Eisenson	41	17	33	19	8	12
Fairbanks	8	3	6	4	2	3

(Continued)

(Continuation of Table 15: Texts)

Fisher	36	15	28	16	8	12
King/DiMichael	10	4	9	5	1	2
Lessac	33	14	20	12	13	20
Linklater	22	9	9	5	13	20
Machlin	3	1	2	1	1	2
Mayer	16	7	15	9	1	2
Moncur/Karr	8	3	7	4	1	2
Rizzo	6	3	5	3	1	2
Skinner	2	1	0	0	2	3
Turner	6	3	1	1	5	8

Topics Covered Early in First Level Course

Of the approaches to instruction during the first two or three weeks that are noted in Table 16, those less used are the teaching of phonetics/IPA symbols and the discussion of speech variety and performances. Each of the other three topic areas indicated are emphasized by one-fourth to more than one-third of the teachers. A significant difference in emphasis seems to be that analysis of each student's voice/speech and identification of areas that need personal improvement rank higher for instructors in non-professional programs (42%), while exercises or "actions" that encourage body relaxation, deep breath support, and easy phonation rank higher for instructors in professional programs (63%).

TABLE 16: Major Teaching Emphasis Early in the First Level Course

Approaches or Topics	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Analysis of each student's speech/ voice & identification of areas that need personal improvement	90	38	71	42	19	29
Exercises or "actions" that encourage body relaxation, deep breath support, and easy phonation	85	36	44	26	41	63
Anatomy and theory of speech production	63	27	52	31	11	17
Normal speech variety and performances to encourage use of it	17	7	15	9	2	4
Phonetics/IPA symbols	9	4	9	5	0	0
No Response	12	5	10	6	2	3

Most Enthusiastic Responses from Students

Student responses are most enthusiastic when a program of exercises is positively pursued (with the teacher leading the group through the exercises) without lengthy discussions about theoretical reasons for doing them. Table 17 reveals that

this was noted by four-fifths of the teachers in professional programs and by half of those in non-professional curricula. Discussions about effective and ineffective models was also cited by about one-third of all the teachers as a way to lead students to physical experimentation to discover how personal habits can affect voice.

Frequently, teachers indicated that discussion of individual voice problems of students occurs in conferences rather than in class. Several teachers motivate students by making tape or video recordings of their work.

TABLE 17: Approaches Generating Most Enthusiastic Responses from Students

Approaches	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
A program of exercises positively pursued without lengthy discussions about theory	138	58	86	50	52	79
Discussions about effective and ineffective models	83	35	68	40	15	23
Students discuss personal voice problems (in class)	56	24	41	24	15	23
Theory lectures or readings on speech production	50	21	39	23	11	17
Other	27	11	18	11	9	14

Physical Approach to Learning

One-fourth of all teachers describe their approach to learning to use the voice more efficiently as not very physical, but few of them teach in professional programs. Two-thirds of all teachers consider their work to be physical in varying degrees. More than four out of five of those in professional programs classify their approach as physical. A number of informants indicated they were unsure of what a "physical" approach was, and several others indicated they emphasize auditory or ear discrimination of sounds to improve vocal work.

TABLE 18: Physical Characteristic of Voice Instruction

Degree	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Not very physical	56	24	49	29	7	10
Physical	123	52	80	47	43	65
Physical only during warm ups	24	10	20	12	4	6
Extremely physical, e.g., taught with stage movement/combat	13	6	6	4	7	11
Other	12	5	9	5	3	5
No Response	9	4	7	4	2	3

Feeling of the Impulse Source When Speaking Strongly

Because many teachers are inclined not to prescribe how students should feel their energy release, this topic was phrased to reflect each instructor's perception of his or her own feeling: "In what area(s) or part(s) of the body do you personally 'feel' the impulse source when speaking strongly emphasized language?"

Four of five teachers indicated that they feel this impulse source in the area of the abdomin or diaphragm (or solar plexsus). These responses suggest medial or central torso contractions which should not create unnecessary tensions in the vocal mechanisms of phonation or resonance. Many teachers commented that the whole body is the impulse source, and several emphasized that the source varies with the emotional state.

However, nearly one-third indicated the source of the impulse to be located in the area of the chest, larynx, or pharynx. Each of these would very likely lead to the hypervalving of the vocal folds (or at least to the phonation and resonation of pitches quite high in the speaker's pitch range). Note that such responses were given by only 15% of the teachers in professional programs as opposed to 34% of the teachers in non-professional programs.

Several teachers labeled their source as the mask or head, which would seem to be their feeling of the resonating tone (forced vibrations) rather than the speech impulse.

TABLE 19: Body Area Where Impulse Source for Strong Speaking is Felt

Part of the Body	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Abdominal or gut area	98	41	67	39	31	47
Diaphragm area	94	40	66	39	28	42
No localized area	40	17	27	16	13	20
Chest or heart area	29	12	23	14	6	9
Larynx or vocal fold area	21	9	19	11	2	3
Pharynx or throat area	18	8	16	9	2	3
Buttocks	10	4	8	5	2	3
Mask/head	6	3	4	2	2	3
Other	17	7	10	6	7	11

Emphasis on Extreme Vocal Dynamics

Only about one in six instructors regularly emphasizes extreme vocal dynamics

(shouts, calls, screams, "weird" vocal characterizations, etc.) in the first level course. More than fifty percent do not ever emphasize such energetic work--including half of those who teach in professional programs. However, several instructors indicated they do teach some "Lessac calls," but that these are not extreme.

TABLE 20: Extreme Vocal Dynamics Emphasized in First Level Course

Emphasized	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Yes	38	16	24	14	14	21
No	130	55	97	57	33	50
Only when students need the skills in other work	58	25	43	25	15	23
No Response	11	5	7	4	4	6

Outside of Class Practice

Most instructors do encourage their students to do some outside of class practice each day--practice of voice exercises (not acting or interpretation practice). About three-quarters recommend 10-15 minutes to one-half hour. Most of those who recommend an hour noted that several shorter practice periods each day are most desirable.

Responses in the "other" category indicated that the practice recommended depends on the particular student's needs and motivation or the type of work being taught.

TABLE 21: Amount of Outside of Class Practice Encouraged

Amount of Time	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
10-15 minutes	96	41	79	46	17	26
30 minutes	82	34	51	30	31	47
One hour	19	8	8	5	11	16
Two hours	2	1	2	1	0	0
None	11	5	10	6	1	2
Other	20	8	16	9	4	6
No Response	7	3	5	3	2	3

Breathing Concepts

Relaxation and Breathing

The majority of all instructors teach relaxation and breathing techniques both separately and integrated with phonation and tone sustention practice. Only about

one in twenty instructors does not teach such work and all of them are in non-professional programs.

TABLE 22: Relaxation and Breathing Techniques Taught Separately or Integrated with Phonation and Tone Sustention Practice

Taught	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Separately	22	9	19	11	3	5
Integrated only	55	23	44	26	11	17
Both	142	60	94	55	48	73
Not taught	11	5	11	6	0	0
No Response	7	3	3	2	4	6

Inhalation

About one-third of all instructors do not encourage either nasal or mouth inhalation for voice exercises. However, about one-half of them do encourage mouth inhalation, either predominantly or in combination with nasal inhalation. Only about one in six instructors emphasizes nasal breathing. However instructors frequently commented that, while nasal is best for exercises, in speaking both mouth and nasal are to be expected.

TABLE 23: Types of Inhalation Encouraged for Voice Exercises

Types	All (237) No.	%	Non Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Nasal	40	17	28	16	12	18
Mouth	55	23	38	22	17	26
Both equally	58	24	36	21	22	33
Neither encouraged	78	33	65	38	13	20
No Response	6	3	4	2	2	3

The term used most often for describing a "deep preparatory breath" for voice exercises and energetic speaking varies a great deal among instructors. Nearly one-half use the term diaphragmatic alone or in combination with abdominal. The "other" category included a number of references to central or medial, back and sides or lower back, and several such as "sigh of relief," "column of air," "cleansing," "yoga," "belt buckle," and "filling the bucket."

TABLE 24: Terms Used Most Often for Describing a Deep Preparatory Breath

Terms	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Diaphragmatic	107	45	83	49	24	36
Abdominal	42	18	31	18	11	17
Diaphragmatic and Abdominal combination	16	7	10	6	6	9
Ribs/back	20	8	8	5	12	18
Chest/thoracic	4	2	4	2	0	0
None emphasized	18	8	16	9	2	3
Other	22	9	12	7	10	15
No Response	8	3	7	4	1	2

Breath Support

About one-half of all instructors use the term diaphragmatic most often for describing appropriate control or maintenance of breath support during voice exercises and energetic speaking. Those instructors who do not consider this term to be correct physiologically must cope with the fact that a new generation of students, performers, and future teachers will continue to use this term. Many "other" terms related to the "whole body," "total response," or several of the listed terms combined. Fewer images were suggested here than for the preparatory breath (above).

TABLE 25: Terms Used Most Often for Describing Appropriate Control or Maintenance of Breath Support

Terms	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Diaphragmatic	110	46	82	48	28	42
Abdominal	47	20	37	22	10	15
Diaphragmatic and Abdominal combination	10	4	7	4	3	5
Ribs/back	4	2	1	1	3	5
Chest/thoracic	6	3	6	4	0	0
None emphasized	26	11	21	12	5	8
Other	26	11	12	7	14	21
No Response	8	3	5	3	3	5

Phonation and Resonance Concepts

Appropriate Pitch Range

Three-fifth of all instructors indicated that about one and a half to two octaves provide an appropriate pitch range for speaking effectively to large audiences (25-100 people or more). Nearly two-thirds of the teachers in professional training programs endorse this concept. Several "other" responses referred to either one to

two octaves, two to three octaves, or one to three octaves—all of which seem to endorse the primary response.

Many written comments noted that the particular pitch range used must be appropriate to the material or text, to the speaker's intent or objective, or to each individual's instrument.

TABLE 26: Appropriate Pitch Range for Speaking Effectively to Large Audiences

Pitch Range	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
About one octave	41	17	34	20	7	11
One and a half to two octaves	139	59	97	57	42	64
At least three octaves	6	3	2	1	4	6
Other	20	8	13	8	7	11
No Response	31	13	25	15	6	9

Reasonable Habitual Modal Pitch

One-third of all instructors indicated that 75% or more of their students employ a reasonable modal pitch habitually. One-fourth of the teachers believe that one-half to two-thirds of their students (between 41 and 74%) do so. However, in Table 27, we see that another fourth believe that one-third or fewer of their students (40% or less) use a reasonable habitual modal pitch. In general, instructors in professional training programs indicated that fewer of their students are using efficient modal pitches. (See Voice Problems later for more details.)

TABLE 27: Percentage of First Level Students Who Employ a Reasonable Modal Pitch Habitually

Percentage	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
90-100%	38	16	32	19	6	9
75-89%	38	16	31	18	7	11
61-74%	21	9	13	8	8	12
41-60%	33	14	23	14	10	15
21-40%	38	16	26	15	12	18
20% or less	29	12	16	9	13	20
No Response	40	17	30	18	10	15

Assessment of Pitch Use

One-half of all instructors always make a conscious assessment of the habitual pitch usage (range and mode) for each student. Table 28 reveals that almost all the other instructors do so when an extreme aberration is apparent. Only about one in

twelve teachers indicated they never consciously assess pitch usage.

TABLE 28: Instructors Who Make a Conscious Assessment of Habitual Pitch Usage (Range and Mode) for Each Student

Circumstances	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Always	114	48	79	46	35	53
Only when extreme aberration is apparent	96	41	74	43	22	33
Never	18	8	12	7	6	9
No Response	9	4	6	4	3	5

In Table 29 we find that three-fifths of all instructors assess pitch usage by their "sensitive, experienced ear" alone. Approximately one-fourth use a standard test, frequently in combination with their "experienced ear."

Of the 60 instructors who use a standard test at some time, 20 referred to tests attributed to Fisher (7), Anderson (6), Fairbanks (4), or Eisenson (3). No other name was mentioned more than once. Several instructors indicated they use their "own test" method.

Twelve instructors described their methods sufficiently to indicate they consider an appropriate habitual modal pitch to be one-fourth to one-third up from the bottom of the total range, or between four and seven steps above the lowest note. Fourteen more indicated they use a piano, but they did not provide any description of the process used.

TABLE 29: Usual Means for Assessment of Habitual Pitch Usage

Means	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
By the instructor's "sensitive, experienced ear"	143	60	103	60	40	61
By some standard test procedure	21	9	19	11	2	3
Both	39	17	23	14	16	24
No Response	33	14	25	15	8	12

Increasing Pitch Flexibility

The most frequently used method for encouraging wider pitch intervals in speaking is the drawing of intonation lines or "pitch contours." Table 30 shows that more than half of all instructors employ this method. However, one-third of the instructors do not use any pitch notation system: drawing intonations, musical nota-

tion, nor pitch phoneme numbering.

Practicing appropriate emotional material while emphasizing dynamic pitch variables such as abrupt shifts to higher or lower keys and dramatic drifting from one key to another was encouraged by half of the instructors.

TABLE 30: Methods Used to Encourage Wider Pitch Intervals in Speaking

Methods	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
The drawing of intonation lines or "pitch contours"	122	52	94	55	28	42
A musical staff notation system	34	14	25	14	9	14
A pitch phoneme numbering system	16	7	11	6	5	8
No pitch notation system	83	35	55	32	28	42
Practicing appropriate emotional material	117	49	83	49	34	52

Pitch Registers

More than one-third of all instructors consider voice ("pitch") registers to be primarily the consequence of the phonation of sound. Table 31 indicates that nearly another third consider the phonation and the resonation of the sound to be equally responsible for various registers. Fewer consider resonance to be the primary determiner of pitch registers.

TABLE 31: Primary Determiner of Pitch Registers

Primary Determiner	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Phonation of sound	84	35	67	39	17	26
Resonation of sound	40	16	25	15	15	23
Both equally	72	30	48	28	24	36
Not concerned	25	11	20	12	5	8
No Response	16	7	11	6	5	8

Between one-third and one-half of all teachers attempt to develop higher "head" registers and lower "chest" registers in their instruction; but only one-third during the first level course. A higher percentage of instructors in professional training programs attempt to develop these registers; many begin this work in the first level course.

TABLE 32: When Higher "Head" and Lower "Chest" Registers are Developed

When	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
In first level courses	79	33	48	28	31	47
In advanced courses	47	20	18	10	29	44

Many informants pointed out the confusion in defining what a pitch register is. Some instructors' comments indicated that registers were used to mean a wider pitch range. Others used registers to mean different resonating cavities. Some comments implied the focus of tone within a resonating cavity. Many who do not use this terminology feel the concept is irrelevant or a hindrance in developing good speaking voices, although they may recognize the value of the concept in developing the full singing range.

Vocal Music Training

One-fourth of all instructors find that students who have had vocal music training do not tend to use their speaking voices better. Table 33 shows that two-thirds of the instructors note there is some value in vocal music training. Many indicated the value is primarily for some types of singers only; this view is held by more than a third of the instructors in professional training programs.

TABLE 33: Students with Vocal Music Training Tend to Use Their Speaking Voices Better

Considered Response	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Yes	93	39	73	43	20	30
Some singers only	68	28	44	26	24	36
No	62	26	44	26	18	27
No Response	14	6	10	6	4	6

Table 34 reveals that alto and baritone singers are viewed as profiting more from their vocal music training than sopranos, tenors, or basses. Several instructors commented that singers who train their higher ranges (sopranos and tenors) often tend to speak far above their optimum range. Many instructors maintained that efficient "carry over" is related to the attitude held about the relationship between the "singing voice" and the "speaking voice," and to the quality of the instruction more than to the singer's range or type.

TABLE 34: Type(s) of Singers Who Use Their Speaking Voices Better

Types	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Sopranos	9	4	7	4	2	3
Altos	20	8	15	9	5	8
Tenors	9	4	7	4	2	3
Baritones	26	11	19	11	7	10
Basses	12	5	10	6	2	3

Several student problems attributed to "poor" singing instruction were "rigidity in posture," "over application of 'singer's' placement" leading to affectation in speech, and the tendency to "listen to themselves."

Terms for "Good" Voice Quality

Each informant was asked to indicate the term(s) he or she uses to describe a "good" voice quality—one in which no particular quality is "excessive" (such as nasality or stridency). Many instructors listed several terms, and the diversity of terms is great. The one term used most frequently is "full."

In the following analysis, an attempt has been made to group terms that have some similarity. The frequency and percentage of use applies to the group of similar terms rather than to each particular word.

TABLE 35: Terms Used for "Good" Voice Quality

Terms	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Full	40	17	26	15	14	21
Clear toned, natural, pure, rich, vibrant, thick, dark, mellow	57	24	39	23	18	27
Redundant terms: resonant, timbre, normal, proper, correct	43	18	33	19	10	15
Personal reactions: pleasant, warm, pleasing, sincere, friendly, agreeable, acceptable, clean	41	17	34	20	7	11
Effortless, free, easy, flowing, smooth, relaxed, moderate, unforced, reaches out & embraces	36	15	25	15	11	17
Open, centered, well-rounded, orotund	30	13	17	10	13	20
Free from a quality disorder, no strain, optimum, neutral	30	13	21	12	9	14
Balanced, mixed, or blended resonance; well-modulated	28	12	18	11	10	15
Flexible, sensitive, versatile, expressive, effective, vital	28	12	19	11	9	14
Superlatives: good, excellent	23	10	16	9	7	11
Full bodied, good body to tone, whole voiced, deep rooted, has bottom or depth, well supported	18	8	9	5	9	14
Firm, authoritative, professional, strong, focused at optimum pitch	13	6	6	4	7	11
Musical, harmonic, melodious, in tune, lyrical, sonorous, ringing	9	4	6	4	3	5
Good tonal life, awareness of sound movement or vibrations in the head or mask	3	1	1	1	2	3

"Focus" or Tone Placement

More than one-third of all instructors indicated they teach focus or tone placement regularly; nearly two-thirds of those in professional programs do so. Table 36 reveals that another one-fifth of them treat focus occasionally.

Most instructors who teach the focus concept only occasionally use it to work with individual students who speak with a throaty voice or in a monotone. Several teachers indicated they use it to aid projection or resonance.

TABLE 36: The Focus or Tone Placement Concept Is Taught

Concept Is Taught	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Yes	91	38	50	29	41	62
Occasionally	52	22	38	22	14	21
No	82	35	73	43	9	14
No Response	12	5	10	6	2	3

Comments from 116 instructors gave some details concerning where they consider appropriate placement to be, how it is defined for students, and some approaches they use in achieving it.

Nearly half of all teachers attempted to clarify the focus concept. Although this represents only two out of five general voice/speech instructors, three-fourths of those teaching in professional acting training programs commented. Two-thirds of those instructors who teach about focus of the voice consider appropriate tone placement to be in the facial mask, forward in the mouth, or on the hard palate. The various locations cited are included in Table 37.

TABLE 37: The Location of Appropriate Tone Placement

Where Focused	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
In the facial mask	38	16	20	12	18	27
In the front of the mouth or forward in the mouth	29	12	15	9	14	21
On the hard palate	10	4	6	4	4	6
In the oral cavity (general use)	7	3	4	2	3	5
In the audience	9	4	7	4	2	3
Miscellaneous	6*	3	4	2	2	3
Wording too vague to interprete	17	7	10	6	7	11
Total informants on focus	116	49%	66	39%	50	76%

*Appropriate focus was designated as "below the diaphragm" by two respondents, "in the upper chest" by one, "in the larynx" by one, "in the back of the throat" by one, and generally "in the head" by one.

The attempts to define focus or placement nearly always were repetitious of the designated area or became involved with an approach or technique concept. Only a few instructors clarified the fact that focus which is forward or mask oriented requires balanced, mixed, blended, or full-tube resonation that utilizes both oral and pharyngeal cavities efficiently.

The most significant difference in the comments between focusing the voice in the front of the mouth (or forward) and placing the tone in the mask was whether the respondent used the term "mask" or mentioned the bone conduction of sound vibrations. For practical purposes, the descriptions and techniques suggested for these two areas of focus were generally the same. The difference would seem to be based on semantics or on personal awareness rather than on a physical differentiation. Perhaps, the amount of energy involved determines whether the speaker feels mask focus ("bone conduction" of strong sound vibrations).

Several instructors indicated that the focus of sound within the oral cavity and mask might vary or shift from one position to another depending on the pitch used. However, no one indicated specific details. (This phenonmenon is utilized in The Lessac System.)

Suggestions for cultivating front/mask focus of the voice, in general, were: yawning for relaxing the jaw and opening the throat, good breath support, concentrating on tongue-tip and lip consonants, practicing materials using front vowels (especially EE /i/), humming and experimenting with the voice, and kinesthetically feeling the changing sound focus.

A few teachers suggested using images such as "a hole in the upper lip," "a beam of light," "a rubber ball bouncing on the back of the auditorium," or "the nozzle of a water hose." Several others suggested using images from Linklater without specifying them.

Twenty-three instructors indicated they use Arthur Lessac's approach to focus, particularly his inverted megaphone, Y-buzz, and call exercises. Thirteen of them designated appropriate focus to be in the mask, five forward in the mouth, and five on the hard palate.

Teachers who indicated focusing on the hard palate as the dominant area often used some terms that suggest front of the oral cavity, but two emphasized mid-oral and soft palate descriptions. The dominant image was to "bounce the voice off the hard palate" as if it were a "blackboard."

Those who indicated a general oral focus suggested negative practice of "voice qualities," an open throat, good breath support, flexible articulation, and listening to recordings of one's voice.

Teachers who indicated that appropriate focus is in the audience emphasize the desire to talk with people and suggest imagining the voice outside the body or beyond the lips, and several encourage the student to "throw his voice."

Standardization of Speech

Standardizing Spoken Dialect

More than half of all teachers indicated that they emphasize some kind of standardization of spoken dialect in the first level course in voice/speech improvement. Work on standardization in advanced courses is more likely in professional training programs. Of course, about half of all advanced courses are offered in departments offering professional acting training.

Comments indicated that, for many instructors, standardization primarily means an awareness of "regionalisms," a study of "General American" or "American Standard" speech, and some adaptability on the part of each student. Other instructors pointed out that their approach to voice/speech improvement--encouraging good voice production and clear articulation--eliminates the need to emphasize any "standardization."

TABLE 38: Emphasis on Standardization of Spoken Dialect

Standardization Emphasized	All (237)		Non-Prof (171)		Prof (66)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
In first level courses	136	57	99	58	37	56
In advanced courses	55	23	24	14	31	47

Instructors in non-professional programs are more likely to require students to use symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) in the first level course than those in professional acting training. See Table 39.

TABLE 39: IPA Symbols Required in First Level Course

IPA Required	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Yes	145	61	118	69	27	41
No	82	34	46	27	36	55
No Response	10	4	7	4	3	5

Approximately half of all instructors of voice/speech improvement courses give equal emphasis to auditory discrimination of sounds (phonemes/allophones of vowels and consonants) and to the personal awareness of physical sensations created when each sound is shaped or articulated efficiently. However, teachers in professional acting programs tend to emphasize physical awareness a great deal more than auditory discrimination. Auditory discrimination has a slight edge over physical awareness for instructors in departments offering more general programs.

TABLE 40: Methods Emphasized for the Discrimination of Sounds

Method Emphasized	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Physical awareness	57	24	26	15	31	47
Auditory discrimination	43	18	39	23	4	6
Both equally	120	51	91	53	29	44
Neither	5	2	5	3	0	0
No Response	12	5	10	6	2	3

Descriptive Terms for Vowels

Eight terms frequently encountered in descriptions of the physical formation of vowels were selected for this portion of the survey. Some or all of these terms may be considered detrimental to good voice/speech improvement by various teachers. Instructors were asked to designate the terms they do employ (but they were not told that any of the terms might be considered objectionable).

It seems significant that nearly one-fourth of all instructors, and nearly one-third of those teaching in professional programs, did not indicate that they use any of these terms. (No Response to survey items is lower than 10% for nearly all other areas covered.) My assumption is that such terminology is not emphasized and that some, if not all, of these terms are possibly objectionable. Table 41 lists each term (with example vowels which could be described by using the term) and the frequency of use by instructors.

Terms significantly less used by instructors in professional programs seem to be "tensed," "lax," "raised," and "back." Several instructors commented that "tensed" is a term to be avoided "at all costs!"—for it "makes the idea of tension a conscious part of voice training and that is the last thing one wants to do." Also "raised" and "back" for the rounded vowels /u/ and /ʊ/ were cited as negative terms by a few instructors.

TABLE 41: Terms Used in Describing the Physical Formation of Vowels

Term Used	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Front (/e/, /æ/)	165	70	123	72	42	64
Back (/ʊ/, /ɔ/)	163	69	123	72	40	61
Tensed (/i/, /u/)	103	44	85	50	18	27
Lax (/ɛ/, /ʊ/)	100	42	81	47	19	29
Short (/ɪ/, /æ/)	76	32	50	29	26	39
Long (/i/, /o/)	75	32	49	29	26	39
Raised (/i/, /u/)	63	27	51	30	12	18
Spread (/i/, /e/)	41	17	31	18	10	15
No terms cited/No Response	54	23	34	20	20	30

Vowels and Pitch Range

Each instructor was asked: "Do you believe that all English vowel sounds can be spoken 'strongly and pleasantly' in all portions of a person's emphatic pitch range?" The emphatic pitch range was defined as that portion between an optimum modal level and the highest note in the speaking range. Table 42 reveals that nearly half of all instructors replied "yes," one-fourth were "not sure," and one-fifth indicated "no."

TABLE 42: All English Vowel Sounds Can Be Spoken "Strongly and Pleasantly" in All Portions of a Person's Emphatic Pitch Range

Belief in Concept	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Yes	99	42	68	40	31	47
No	52	22	35	21	17	26
Not sure	58	25	48	28	10	15
No Response	28	12	20	12	8	12

Because the shaping of vowel sounds affects the physical characteristics of the oral-pharyngeal resonating tube, it was assumed many instructors in voice/speech

improvement would have discovered some strong correlation between cavity shapes and efficient resonance of various sound frequencies. Therefore, those who indicated "no" (the 52 instructors who believe that all vowels cannot be spoken "strongly and pleasantly" in all portions of a person's emphatic pitch range) were asked to indicate the portion of the emphatic pitch range that would accommodate each of the vowels / i ɑ u ɔ / most successfully. These four vowels were chosen because the articulators create quite different shapes for each and because each may often occur in the stressed syllables of emphasized words (e.g., "Please!" "It's hot!" "Cool it!" "Don't fall!").

Table 43 shows the responses from these 52 instructors, but the sample is too small to draw any particular conclusions. Perhaps the most obvious fact is that many of these instructors frequently favored the mid+low portion of the pitch range as most accommodating.

TABLE 42: Portion of the Emphatic Pitch Range That Accommodates Specific Vowels Most Successfully

Vowel	Portion of Range	All (52) No.	%	Non-Prof (35) No.	%	Prof (17) No.	%
/i/	High+mid	27	52	20	57	7	41
/i/	Low+mid	24	46	15	43	9	53
/ɑ/	High+mid	17	33	9	26	8	47
/ɑ/	Low+mid	30	58	23	66	7	41
/u/	High+mid	18	35	13	37	5	29
/u/	Low+mid	29	56	20	34	9	53
/ɔ/	High+mid	10	19	6	17	4	24
/ɔ/	Low+mid	35	67	26	43	9	53
/ɔ/	High+mid+low	1	2	0	0	1	6

Rhythmic Variety

To develop flexibility in using the voice for characterization, 142 (60%) of all instructors encourage students to practice appropriate emotional material emphasizing dynamic tempo/rate variables such as long or short pauses and clipped or sustained articulations. Instructors in general programs were 110 (64%); those in professional training programs, 32 (49%).

Table 43 reveals the number of stresses used for analyzing speech rhythms. It is significant that nearly half of the instructors did not indicate that they

attempt to teach any analysis based on stress. Three degrees of stress or two (binary analysis of strong-weak syllables only) are used most frequently. Fewer instructors in professional programs teach such analysis than in general programs.

TABLE 43: Number of Stresses Used in Analyzing Speech Rhythms

Number of Stresses Used	All (237)		Non-Prof (171)		Prof (66)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Two	49	21	36	21	13	20
Three	63	27	52	30	11	17
Four	22	9	15	9	7	11
No Response	104	43	69	40	35	53

Common Voice/Speech Problems

Each instructor in voice/speech improvement programs was asked to list two or three common vocal problems that many of their students share. The problems that were mentioned most frequently are poor articulation (30%), nasality (29%), dialect distortions (27%), lack of breath support (25%), breathy quality (22%), and narrow pitch range (19%). Instructors in professional acting programs also emphasized harsh quality and throaty focus of sound as major problems among their students. Table 44 characterizes the various problems cited using several descriptive phrases from the informants.

Inefficient pitch level was voluntarily listed as a common problem by only 13 percent of all instructors. However, this low proportion may be the result of an earlier request in the survey which asked them to indicate the percent of their students who needed to make an adjustment in their habitual modal pitch level.

Table 45 reveals that one-fourth of all instructors perceive that 40 percent or more of their students need to lower their habitual modal pitch; among instructors in professional programs the proportion increases to one-third.

Table 46 reveals that one instructor in eight perceives that 40 percent or more of their students need to raise their habitual modal pitch; one in five instructors in professional programs has this perception.

TABLE 44: Common Voice/Speech Problems Cited

Problems Cited	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
Preparation for Speaking						
Tight jaw, narrow oral opening, spread lips	18	8	11	6	7	11
Tensions: in neck and shoulders, upper chest vocal impulse, a need to relax	22	9	17	10	5	8
Lack of breath support, inadequate respiration, shallow or high chest breathing, fading or loss of energy on ends of lines	59	25	36	21	23	35
Phonation						
Breathy or aspirate quality, lack of force or intensity, thin or weak tone, projection problem	53	22	40	23	13	20
Harsh quality, straining, hyper-valving of vocal folds, pushing, laryngeal or pharyngeal tensions, constricting on larger emotional moments	34	14	21	12	13	20
Narrow pitch range, lack of intonation variety, monotone	46	19	37	22	9	14
Inefficient pitch level (See Tables 45 and 46.)	30	13	20	12	10	15
Resonation						
Inefficient balance or blend of resonance, lack of cavity reinforcement, placement problems	38	16	29	17	9	14
Nasality: assimilative and twang types	69	29	48	28	21	32
Denasality	7	3	5	3	2	3
Throaty or rear tone focus, husky, lack of open throat	30	13	18	11	12	18
Articulation						
Poor articulation or diction, dropping final consonants, slurring, lack of firmness and muscularity in consonant formation	71	30	56	33	15	23
Dialect distortions; flat vowels; ethnic, colloquial, regional pronunciations; vowel substitutions: /ɪ/ for /ɛ/, /a/ for /aɪ/, /ar/ for /aɪɚ/, /ɑ/ for /ɔ/, /eə/ for /ɛ/, /æə/ for /æ/	64	27	43	25	21	32
Consonant substitutions: /d/ for /t/, /d/ for /ð/, /n/ for /ŋ/; and /s/ problems	17	8	13	8	4	7
Expressiveness						
Lack of "variety," flexibility, emphasis; limited dynamics	31	13	23	14	8	12
Rate problems: monotonous rate or pacing, too rapid	33	14	28	16	5	8

(Continued)

(Continuation of Table 44: Problems)

Phrasing, insufficient number and length of pauses	7	3	7	4	0	0
Lack of sensitivity, enthusiasm, empathy; inability to feel; minimum word coloration; "fear" of voice revealing thought or feelings	8	3	5	3	3	5
No Response	17	7	13	8	4	6

TABLE 45: Percentage of First Level Students Who Need to Lower Their Habitual Modal Pitch

Percentages of Students	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
60% or more	25	11	16	9	9	14
40-55%	37	16	25	15	12	18
20-35%	47	20	31	18	16	25
15% or less	87	37	67	39	20	27
No Response	41	17	32	19	9	14

TABLE 46: Percentage of First Level Students Who Need to Raise Their Habitual Modal Pitch

Percentages of Students	All (237) No.	%	Non-Prof (171) No.	%	Prof (66) No.	%
60% or more	9	4	6	2	3	5
40-55%	19	8	9	5	10	15
20-35%	39	17	24	14	15	23
15% or less	128	55	100	58	28	44
No Response	42	18	32	19	10	15

Concluding Observations

The information in this study represents the views of teachers of voice/speech improvement in 26 percent of all the departments in the United States that offer degrees in speech and theatre. Also, another 10 percent of the departments reported that they offer no courses in this area.

There is great diversity represented both in approaches to teaching and in perceptions about theory and voice problems. Some variety was anticipated, for only controversial issues were selected for this study. The tables in this survey report can provide teachers and administrators with sufficient data to compare various aspects of their programs with those offered in other colleges and universities.

Interpretation comments have been limited to pointing out the major areas of agreement among voice/speech instructors and making some comparisons between views held by teachers in professional acting programs and those held by teachers in more general curricula. No serious attempt was made to evaluate the relative merits of various concepts—that must be done by each reader.

Bibliography

References

Covert, Anita. "Michigan Community Colleges' Speech Communication Curricula." Michigan Speech Association Journal 13 (1978), 46-55.

Directory of American Theatre Association. ATA, 1978.

Directory of American Theatre Programs. ATA, 1976.

Speech Communication Directory. Speech Communication Association, 1978.

Related Publications

Rubin, Lucille S. Stage Voice Training in the London Schools. Purchase, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1978.

Stern, David A. "Understanding Voice Quality by Understanding Vocal Function." Theatre News, 11 (May 1979), 14-17.

Texts Cited in Table 15, pp. 9-10

Anderson, Virgil A. Training the Speaking Voice. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Berry, Cicely. Voice and the Actor. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Eisenson, Jon. Voice and Diction: A Program for Improvement. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan, 1979.

Fairbanks, Grant. Voice and Articulation Drillbook. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

Fisher, Hilda B. Improving Voice and Articulation. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

King, Robert G., and Eleanor M. DiMichael. Articulation and Voice: Improving Oral Communication. New York: Macmillan, 1978.

Lessac, Arthur. The Use and Training of the Human Voice. 2nd ed. New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1967.

Linklater, Kristin. Freeing the Natural Voice. New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1976.

Machlin, Evangeline. Speech for the Stage. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1966.

Mayer, Lyle V. Fundamentals of Voice and Diction. 5th ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown, 1978.

Moncur, John P., and Harrison Karr. Developing Your Speaking Voice. 2nd ed. Harper & Row, 1972.

Rizzo, Raymond. The Voice As an Instrument. 2nd ed. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill, 1977.

Skinner, Edith. Speak With Distinction. (Publication data not available; contact Juilliard Drama School.)

Turner, J. Clifford. Voice and Speech in the Theatre. 3rd ed., rev. Malcolm Morrison. London: Pittman, 1977.